



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,929	02/14/2002	Toshiki Kawasome	6304.620	5326

7590

11/07/2003

Joseph W. Berenato, III
Liniak, Berenato, Longacre & White, LLC
Ste. 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817

EXAMINER

LIU, MING HUN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2675

DATE MAILED: 11/07/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,929

Applicant(s)

KAWASOME, TOSHIKI

Examiner

Ming-Hun Liu

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Two handed input system, program, and recording medium.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because several figures, such as figures 3 and 5 have descriptions written in both English and Japanese. Please correct the drawings to include only the English descriptions. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 8, the limitation with 'where the second input device differs from the first input device' is repeated from parent claim 1 and does not further limit the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-21 and 34-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by US patent 5,798,752 to Buxton et al.

In reference to claim 1, it can be seen from figure 1 of Buxton, that he teaches an input system with a first input device and second input device for executing a computer program. The first input device controls the positioning of elements on the display screen (column 5, line 40). The second input device is different from the first input device and includes an instruction set to change the display state of the object area of the display screen (column 5, lines 42-50).

In reference to claims 2 and 3, Buxton describes an input system where the instruction set instructs a change in the relative position and magnification ratio of the object area according to operations performed on the second input device (section 3.07, specifically column ²⁴~~9~~, lines 49-54 and lines 64-67).

In reference to claim 4, Buxton describes an input system where the instruction set instructs a change of the display size of an object obtained contained within the object area according to operations performed on the second input device (column 30, lines 30-32 and column 21, lines 36-40).

In reference to claim 5, it is clear when referring to the figures and their brief descriptions that Buxton teaches the use of editing features controlled by the second input device.

In reference to claim 6, Buxton describes an instruction set where operations performed on the second input device are compatible with the application program executed by the computer (column 4, lines 40-43 and column 10, lines 62-66).

Referring to claim 7, Buxton teaches that the first input device is selected from a group consisting of a mouse, trackball, touch pad and pen tablet (column 8, lines 4-7).

Referring to claim 8, Buxton also teaches that the second input device is selected from the group consisting a scroll wheel, a trackball a touch pad, a key switch and a combination of input devices (column 8, line 4-15).

In reference to claims 9-11, Buxton clear teaches that the combination of input devices comprises a wheel, ball, and key switch and incorporates this input device into the invention.

In reference to claims 12 and 13, it can be seen from figure 1 that Buxton discloses a third input device, different from the first and second, that is connected to the computer, where the third input device is a keyboard (item 25).

Claims 16 and 24 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 17 and 25 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 2.

Claims 18 and 26 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 3.

Claims 19 and 27 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 4.

Claims 20 and 28 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 5.

Claims 21 and 29 are rejected on grounds outlined in the rejection of claim 6.

In reference to claims 22 and 23, Buxton teaches the incorporation of a file storage memory and system for (figure 1, items 17 and 20) storing computer programs readable by the processor (item 12) of the computer and recording the program onto the storage medium (column 7, lines 48-58).

In reference to claim 30, claim 30 is rejected on grounds similar to the rejection of claim 1, with the addition disclosure from Buxton's figure 1 where he teaches a computer system comprising a computer and a display screen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buxton.

In reference to claim 14, Buxton does not explicitly disclose in the incorporation of a fourth input device, different from the rest, however Buxton leaves room for such additions with the numerous alternate input devices he lists on column 8, lines 3-15. One skilled in the art understands that computer systems can support several input devices. It would have been simple to add a fourth input device with the abundant amount of USB and PS/2 ports in computers. Furthermore, one could argue that the component item 30 houses several different input devices, in which case Buxton does in fact anticipate such a claim. Nonetheless, adding additional input

Art Unit: 2675

devices to computer systems is an extremely conventional practice as different users have different preferences in the input devices usage.

As to claim 15, it is clear from figure 1, that Buxton offers a keyboard as option for an input device.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


US Patent 6,232,957 to Hinckley: Two handed input device operational system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ming-Hun Liu whose telephone number is 703-305-8488. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras can be reached on 703-305-9720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

Ming-Hun Liu


STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600